

Grammatical Exceptions:
OR, SOME
OBSERVATIONS
UPON THE
ALTERATIONS
OF
Late Years made in Our
ACCIDENCE
AND
LATIN GRAMMAR,
Being an Enquiry into the *Reasonable-
ness* and *Necessity* of them.

Recommended to be carefully and candidly Perused by
all School-masters, and their Assistants, as well as to
all private Tutors, by JAMES GIBSON, Curate of
Wootton-Underwood, Bucks, and sometime School-master
of *Bray in Berks.*

———*Non ego paucis
Offendor Maculis.*

HORAT. de *Arte Poet.*

O X F O R D :
Printed by L. Lichfield, for the AUTHOR: And
Sold by A. Peisley, Bookseller in Oxford. 1729.

Vol. A4 e. 2363



T O T H E
R E A D E R.

WHatever Reception these *Observations* may find in the World, I hope I shall ever have this *Satisfaction*, that I have not writ them with the least Intention to give any Person Offence. They were occasion'd indeed by finding several *Alterations* made in the *Grammar*, which I am satisfied ought not to have been made ; and my design in Publishing of 'em is to try, whether it may prove a means to prevail with *Authority* to cause our *Grammar* to be examin'd, the Faults corrected, and such small Additions made, as to *experienced Persons* shall be thought proper. If this End be obtain'd, my Design and Desire both will be fully answer'd, and I could not think of any way likely to effect it but this ; for to address myself to any single Person in such an Affair, I thought was to do nothing. None but the *Higher Powers* can help in such a Case as this.

How Satisfactory it will be both to *Teacher* and *Learner*, to have the *Grammar* settled, needs not be disputed ; and such a thing effected, may prove a means of removing those *Objections*, which have been so freely and so frequently made against it ; and of retrieving, by degrees, that *Regularity* of Teaching, which was in former Times. Learned Men may make New *Grammars*, but it will prove Labour in vain ; for the Method of our *Grammar* is so surpassing, the Rules of it so plain, and easy and pleasant, that

in my poor Opinion there are none like them. I know *Exceptions* are taken against the Multiplicity of *Examples* in *Syntax*; but it ought to be consider'd, that the *Grammar* would not be perfect, if every Branch of the *Rule* should not be exemplified; and tho' we are oblig'd (in all due Obedience to the *Government*) to Teach this *Grammar*, and no other, yet are we not prescrib'd how much of it we shall Teach. Some teach one *Example* to a *Rule* in *Syntax*, and think that sufficient, and some teach all. I have often thought with my self, that if such as cannot come up to that height, or think it not proper to do so, would but teach *Two Examples* to a *Rule*, viz. the two First; and *Three*, where there are no more, that it would be much better, than to teach *One* only; and not only so, but as soon learned, and with more Pleasure; for teaching but *one Example* crumbles the *Syntax* into such Bits and Fragments, that it carries but little Substance or Pleasure with it.

If it be objected, many good *Scholars* have been made with teaching but *one Example*. I answer, If there have, yet if *Two* be learn'd in a manner as soon as *One*, and with more Pleasure to the *Learner*, surely *Two* must be better than *One* only. Besides, this Advantage will attend it, if a Child be remov'd from a School where they do not teach all the *Examples*, to One that does teach all, the more *Examples* he learns, the better it will be for him. For my part, I cannot think *one Example* so well as *Two*, and because I would not make much marking in the *Grammar*, they should be the two First generally. I have been told, and but very lately, that in a very *eminent School*, where formerly they used to teach all, they now teach half.

Let

The Preface.

iii

Let the same *Grammar* be settled never so much, there will be some *Diversities* in the way of teaching of it. Some are altogether for teaching by an *English Grammar*, pleading, that it is unreasonable, that *the Principles of an unknown Language should be taught in an unknown Tongue*. For this purpose, What can be better than our *Accidence*? No better *English Grammar* can be. I know formerly it was taught, and all parsing at first learn'd by it, and I have been told, an eminent *School-master* was more careful to have it perfect, than the *Latin Syntax*: but the *Preface* to the *Grammar* does not require learning it thorough, but to learn the *English Rules* as occasion requires in *Parsing*. The ways of teaching which *English Rules* I observe have been various: Some taught 'em all off-book (which is more than needs, for the principal are sufficient, considering the *Latin Syntax* must be learn'd afterwards) construing and explaining all the *Examples*. Some besides this Parsed all the *Examples*. This I think also to be more than needs, (tho' Mr. Hoole's way) because the *Preface* to the *Grammar* directs to the learning of some pretty Book, and learning the *Rules* as occasion serves. Some teach only the *Rules* of the *Concords*, and the *Case* of the *Relative*, missing the Page upon which the word *sometimes* is so often repeated, and to make *Satisfaction* for the rest, cause the Children in learning the *Latin Syntax* to have recourse to the *English Rules*, when they explain the *Latin*. Mr. Dugard, in his *Rudiments*, teaches only *three Rules* for the *three Concords*, and then goes to the *Rule* of the *Relatives*; afterwards he alters the *Rules* a little, and changes some *Examples*. Certainly our *English Rules* cannot well be mended, let *Masters of Schools* use them how they will. As to the *Rules* of

asking the Question, *Who* or *What*? whether a Master cause his Scholar to learn them off-book or not, they are undoubtedly very requisite to be there, because when he comes to make *Latin*, he must be told and shew'd them. And many other Parts, both in the *Accidence* and *Grammar*, are highly requisite to stand (tho' they be omitted in *Learning*) that recourse may be had to them upon occasion.

The nearer Masters come to a *Conformity* in *Teaching*, it must needs be so much the better: but (as has been said) let the same *Grammar* be never so strictly enjoyn'd to be taught, there will be some *Diversity* in the ways of *Teaching* it: but then the *Inconvenience* of yours is nothing in Comparison of what teaching other *Grammars* is. Mr. *Wheeler*, Author of the *Royal Grammar Reform'd*, taught his said *Grammar* in *Glo'ster-School* during his time, as I have been inform'd by a *Reverend Gentleman*, once of that School; but after his Decease, his *Successor* brought in *Lilie* again, for which he was much to be commended. And I cannot think but it might be brought in again, into the greatest School in *England*, without much Difficulty, or long expence of time. For if *Select Places* were pick'd out, and *Authors* laid aside the while, the higher Boys would go through it presently, and after that, some of them might be taken in to assist in teaching the lower Boys; which would be a Profit to both of them. And if they should not teach the higher Boys so much, as they might think fit for the lower to learn, with diligent following, I cannot think but *Two Months* or *Three* at most, would effectually overcome the Difficulty. So far as I can perceive, where they teach Dr. *Busby's Greek Grammar* instead of *Cambden's*, they do not teach a quarter of it. Tho' *Grammar* ought

The Preface.

V

to be prized, yet it is not learned to make every one a meer *Grammarian*, but only as a *Substruction* or *Introduction* to that real and useful *Knowledge*, whereby a Man may become *Serviceable* and *Beneficial* to the Publick.

Masters of Schools indeed, and other *Professors* of the *Science*, ought to be well acquainted with it, but for others it is not so necessary to know every Part of it. *A religious and vertuous Education* of *Youth* (as the *Canons* require) accompanied with good *Learning*, particularly of *Select places* out of *Latin and Greek Authors*, is the chief *Business* of a *School*, and where good *Principling* of *Children* is wanting, the chief thing is wanting. What *Solomon* says is well known, *Train up a Child in the way that he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it.* And again, *Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore get Wisdom,* such *Wisdom* as will make a Man wise unto *Salvation*. There is abundance of good *Lessons* in *Heathen Authors*, and if made use of to a right end, they are of great worth.

I once had occasion to go to Dr. *Burnet*, late *Bishop of Sarum*, for a *Licence* to teach *School*: He ask'd me a many *Questions*, amongst which one was, *What Grammar did I teach?* *Lily's.* 'Tis reckoned, says he, *the worst of any.* This I thought was a *Mistake* in his *Lordship*, upon a double account, but attributed it to the *Education* he had had in his own native *Country*. However he was very kind to me, and gave me a great deal of good *Advice*, as, to teach the *Children* their *Catechism*, our *Saviour's Sermon* on the *Mount*, the *Gospels*, *Epistles*, &c. and gave me a *Strict Charge* to forbid 'em *taking God's Name in vain*, *Lying*, *using bad Words*, and all such *Vices*, as *Children* were apt to be guilty of.

Tho'

Tho' Grammar and good School-learning (by which I mean good Morality and good History, as well as Language) be a great part of a School-Master's Care ; yet *Religion* ought to have a proper time allotted for it, as I hope it has in all *Schools*. And now Who is fit for so great and so laborious an Undertaking ? He must be a *Scholar*, he must be *diligent*, and a *patient prudent Man* : for he that cannot govern himself, I mean his own *Passions*, is not fit to govern a School. As the *Education* of Children ought to be *liberal*, so the more they are used in an *ingenuous* manner, the better will many take their Learning, and yet there will be a necessity for giving *Correction* sometimes, but this ought to be with *Care* and *Moderation*. I look upon the *Ferula* to be an improper Weapon for *Correction*, and all *beating* about the Head both hurtful, and unlawful.

What I shall add more shall be about the various Methods of *Teaching* our Grammar. Some did use to teach all the *Accidence*, *Propria quæ maribus*, *As in præsentî*, all *Syntax*, and all *Quæ genus*, and *Figura* : Others make great Omissions in comparison of that, omit the *Optative* and *Potential Moods*, all the *Redundantia* in *Quæ genus*, teach but one *Example* in *Syntax*, and not a word of *Figura*. Were I to teach again, If a *Pronoun* had the division into *Substantive* and *Adjective* inserted, I should omit a little there ; the *Optative Mood*, and all the *Potential*, but the two *First Tenses*, and only keep two *Signs* : at *irregular Verbs*, I would order *cum* to be writ instead of *utinam*, and call it *Subjunctive*, and either omit the *Rule* following, or else alter it a little. At a *Participle*, I would teach 'em as first rank'd, for all they are otherwise placed, and (tho' all the *Rules* are requisite to be there) I should
be

The Preface.

vii

be apt to leave off at *Of a Verb active*, and *Of a Verb neuter*; teach only *two* or *three* of the first sorts of *Adverbs*, *two* of *Conjunctions*; and of *Interjections* *two*, perhaps none. *The English Rules* for the *Concords*, and *Case* of the *Relative* (omitting one Page where the word *sometimes* is so often repeated) I would teach; *the two first Rules* at the *Construction* of *Substantives*, and the *first Rule* under every Head afterwards, taking the first Rule for *Gerunds* for all that follow. This I think would not detain a Child in his Learning, but give him an *Idea* and *Notion* of his *Accidence*, whether made use for *parfing*, or explaining *Syntax*, or both. And perhaps I might put him to *construing*, and *explaining* all the *Examples* to the *Rules*, tho' not learn 'em off-book, at one time or other, and if I found no occasion for it, I could let them alone. After *Propria quæ maribus*, and *As in præfenti*, each learn'd twice over (besides Repetitions) and some words in each declin'd, I would proceed to *Syntax*, and either teach all, or teach *Two Examples* at least to every *Rule*, and *three* where there was no more: yet some places are omitted wholly in most Schools, as at *Nonnulla Impersonalia*; *Ubi, postquam & cum*; *Etsi, tametsi*. After this *Quæ genus*, missing all the *Redundantia*, except six Lines at *Hæc Simul*. In *Figurâ*, a small Number of the chief *Rules* should serve. In *Prosodiâ*, the first Page, and only name the *quinque, quæ tonorum Regulas perturbant*, 'till I came at *Syllabæ Communes*. I would omit the *Cæsura Species*, and all the *Genera Carminum*, except the *two first*, leave off at *Discant*, go to *Mediæ Syllabæ*, and teach what was necessary, and last of all, all the *Rules* for the *Ultim Syllables*.

There

There are many other *Rules* in several parts of the *Grammar*, which Children ought to learn, either as occasion serves, or else to have singled out and mark'd for *Observation*.

Gram-



Grammatical Exceptions :

O R,

Some Observations upon the Alterations of late Years made in our *Accidence* and *Latin Grammar*, being an Enquiry into the Reasonableness and Necessity of them.

SCHOOL-LEARNING, and particularly above any other Part, the *Rudimental*, having been both my Study and Practice from my Childhood, to above 60 Years of Age; and after some Intermission from it, by reason of a small Curacy, having had a Call again for some time of late to peruse our *Accidence* and *Grammar*, I was surpriz'd when I found such Alterations in them. I am not unsensible how many Complaints have been made against this excellent Piece of Work, (as is common to every thing establish'd by Law, tho' never so good,) yet I always understood it to be for the Prolixness rather than Imperfection of it; which whilst several, and that some eminent Men, as *Farnaby*, *Danes*, and Others, have studied to amend, they have fallen vastly, almost *infinitely* short of this, both as to its *Perfection*, and true both *Usefulness* and *Easiness* of making a *Scholar*.

A

I

I have been formerly (as Assistant) under a great School-Master, and Famous in his time: his Custom was to have his Scholars decline Nouns *without an Article*, and instead of *Lilie's Syntax*, to teach *Syntaxis Erasiana constrictior*, a small imperfect thing. When I had a School my Self, I follow'd for a time, his way of declining without an Article, but notwithstanding *Alvar* and *Vossius* be so much for it, found not that Satisfaction in it, as in the *Ancient way* of declining with it. All the *ancient Latin Grammarians* used the *Article*, and departing from *Antiquity*, and Rules well establish'd, seldom proves Successful. *Compendium* is generally *dispendium* in such Cases, and the way of the *Ancients* will be found both more *safe* and *profitable* to walk in, than any *late novel* Inventions. *Quæro compendium sine dispendio*. I love not Gold that will not go.

If it be objected to me, that *Lilie's Grammar* is not so *perfect* and *complete*, as I pretend, and therefore it was proper to make *Additions* to it, and some *Alterations*: I answer, 1. The Question is, Whether these *Alterations* and *Additions* that are made be *necessary*, or indeed *useful*: I think they are neither, but the *contrary*, and sometimes *erroneous*: but this I must leave to better Judgments. All I propose is, to set down the *Alterations* and *Additions* in order as I find them, and to make some short Remarks upon them. 2. I answer, That *absolute Perfection* belongs to God only, and we must not expect that any *humane* Work or Invention can be truly perfect. Nay, I may say, that some *Imperfection* may become it, and in some respects be rather an *Ornament* to it than a *Blemish*, as I hope will appear in the Sequel. What Bp *Taylor* in his Rules of *Holy Living* says, in his Section of *Contentedness*, may not be here impertinent. 'The Greek (saith he) that designed to 'make the most exquisite Picture that could be imagined, 'fancied the Eye of *Chione*, and the Hair of *Pægnium*, and 'Tarfia's Lip, *Philenium's* Chin, and the Forehead of *Delphia*, 'and set all these upon *Melphidippa's* Neck, and thought that 'he should out-do both Art and Nature. But when he came 'to view the Proportions, he found that what was excellent 'in *Tarfia*, did not agree with the other Excellency of *Phile-*
nium;

'*nium*; and altho' singly they were rare Pieces, yet in the whole they were very disagreeable. In our late *Grammarians* we may find some things which may delight and please; but for an *entire, safe and easy* System to Teach by, I think no *Grammar* comes up to *Lilie's*, and That is the only *Grammar* which by the *Law* we are required to teach.

It is not my desire to reflect upon any Person or Persons that have made these *Alterations*; undoubtedly their Design in it was good: but I wonder how they obtain'd Leave to publish what they have done. Neither do I blame any for a more earnest Application to the Study of *Grammar*, it being a Fault which some may have an *innocent* Propensity to: I will only presume to say this, That it is both a *pleasant* and *diverting* Study; but if a Man once run into *excess*, how many *Errors* and how many *Dangers* may he run into by a *fanciful* over-criticizing! *Scaliger* says, *Grammatico nihil infelicius*. All over-doing is but spoiling any thing. Certainly the best way is to be contented and pleased with what *wise* and *learn'd* Men have established. This is all I shall say by way of *Preface*. I will now apply my self to the *Alterations*.

And here the first thing I observe as a Fault, is *changing the Letter of the Accidence*, and *altering and displacing several Pages*, which I think were much better before, than they are now. I have known the *Accidence* Printed in a very fine Black Letter, and why may it not be so still? And as for *altering* the Pages, If it be said, It was done in Honour of Queen *Anne*, to have *Semper Eadem* set at the bottom of a capital A, (which takes up a great part of the Page,) and so could not be avoided: I answer, I cannot like of this by any means: for not only the *Coherence* of the first Page is broke, but also the *Rules* of the *Cases* upon the Second unhappily parted; which *Rules*, both for making *Latin* and parsing *English* are of singular use, and ought not to be so mangled. As for the *Black Letter* I am not so solicitous for that quite, as I am for having the *same quantity* Printed upon a Page as formerly; or at least so much as is printed in the *Cambridge* Edition. The *Oxford* Edition also in 1714 is plain, but very beautiful.

P. 4. Also *dea, mula, equa, liberta, anima, famula, serva, socia, duæ, ambæ*.—I think there is no need for such a long train of these words, especially for young Beginners, the *Accidence* being only a short *Introduction* to the *Grammar*, which *Grammar* is to contain more fully what was omitted in the *Accidence*. And reason good; for if the *Accidence* be designed perfectly to comprehend what is contained in the *Latin Grammar*, what need have we of a *Latin Grammar* at all? The *Addition* of these words then seems to me, to be *contrary* to the design of the *Accidence*, and *more proper* for the *Grammar*.

P. 5. *Genius, & Geni*, and *meus* Vocativo *mi*. What need can there be of this Addition? *Meus* is declin'd in the *Grammar*, and so there needs no Rule for it. I remember it used to be an old School-question, *Quare meus facit mi in Vocativo?* And the Answer used to be, *Quia venit ab antiquo mius*. Many *Grammars* have I seen in my time, but can hardly remember, ever Any took further Notice of the declining of this word than Ours does. Only the *Oxford Notes* say, *mi* is by an *Apocope* for *mie* from the old Nominative *mius*, and that it is used in all Genders. How suitable such needless Perplexities are for Children, and proper for an *Accidence* or *short Introduction* let others judge. And as for *Genius* making *Geni*; what good Author can be produced for it? If it be answered, *Tibullus*; I reply, Is it not well known what liberty *Poets* take in making use of Figures, *metri causâ*; and why might not he say *Geni* for *Genie* by an *Apocope*? But again, Who ever had, unless it was a *vain Poet*, or is like to have occasion to use this word in a Vocative case? And it being a word a School-boy rarely meets with, all the while he is at School, and that, when he is perfect in his *declensions*, what matter is it for a *Rule* for the Vocative case of this word? Nay further, were there never so good Authority for it, unless it were of more use, it would be more pertinently put in the *Grammar* than in the *Accidence*, the *Accidence* being as it were a step to the *Grammar*, and the *Grammar* a step to *Classick Authors*.

Bacchus. I am apt to think this is the first time ever any *Grammatician* put *Bacchus* amongst words that made their Vocative in *e* or in *us*. Above 40 years ago, when we learned *Stockwood's Disputations*, that excellent School-book, in which the *Author* has shewed himself a great *Defender* of our *Grammar*, I remember it very well, that nothing was more common than to solve the difficulties of these two Sentences,

Adsis, lætitiæ Bacchus dator, and

Projice tela manu, Sanguis meus,

by an *Antiptosis*, or an *Atticism*; and our Rules were these two known ones, *Antiptosis est positio casûs pro casu*: and *Atticè semper Vocativus idem est cum Nominativo*. And I have found since, That *Sanguis meus* is reckoned a *durior Antiptosis* by some learned foreign Grammarians. In my thoughts a Rule may as well be made for *meus* making both *mi* and *meus* in the Vocative case, as for *Bacchus* making the Vocative case in *e* or in *us*.

P. 7. *Facies*. I know very well that *Meridies* has been a word long carp'd at for two Reasons; partly because it is not of the Feminine Gender, and partly because it is said to want the Plural Number. Neither of which Reasons seem to me sufficient to change it for a new Example. 1. Because methinks the Rule following does not come after *Facies* so properly as after *Meridies*. 2. I cannot see, why *Meridies* should be said to want the plural Number. If one should say, *Singulis meridiibus Scholares conferunt se pransum*, I question whether the Man would not deserve to be accounted over-critical that should find fault with it. If all Nouns must be defective in such Cases and Numbers as they cannot be found in, in an approved Author, I question whether many words may not be found defective, which are little suspected to be so. Besides I think *Meridies* does not sound harshly in the plural Number, any more than *Soles* does in *Virgil*, only some are apt to accent it wrong and say *meridies* for *meridies*. If this word must be changed, then it may be a Query whether *dies* ought not to be placed first, in the following Rule.

Ibid. *Alius* hath *aliud* neuter. This is an ancient marginal Observation. Qu. Whether it were not better put into the Rule thus, Saving that *alius* hath *aliud* neuter, and that these five last rehearsed, &c. Or added to it, after some such manner as this, And that *alius* hath *aliud* neuter. Or, and that *alius* maketh *aliud* in the neuter Gender.

P. 12. *Margent.* By the figure *Evocation*. I cannot see what use this Note is of. And *ibid.* Except *ego, nos, tu & vos*. The Rules before are so plain, that this seems perfectly needless; and if so, then not proper for a brief *Introduction*. I know it is usual in Schools to tell Children this by way of *Explanation*, And most that have writ Books of that nature may take notice of it, but why should needless *Explanations* be presumptuously put into the Text? I for my part think it much the worse for this Addition, and am satisfied, Children would take more notice of it, if it were left out, and they only put in mind of it as occasion should require.

P. 16. *Margent.* Except *do* and *its Compounds*, when they are of the first Conjugation. Why may not recourse be had to the *Latin Grammar* for this, as well now as in former times? And besides, it takes away the room for the *Figures*, which were to point to the different *Characteristicks* of the *Conjugations*. And when all is done, the Compounds of *do*, when of the first Conjugation, do but seldom come in the way of little Boys.

P. 21. *Erīmus eritis*, This is a very gross fault, to mark that long, which is always short: I say no more of it, but refer him that doubteth to *Smetius's Prosodia*.

P. 38. *Vaba*, formerly *vab* only. *Vab* is twice put under two different Significations, and I observe some *Grammarians* make *vab* an Interjection, *Exultantis & interdum insultantis*; the distinguishing of which must necessarily arise from the manner of Speaking. In *Corderius's Colloquies* one begins, *Heus Abrahame*, and the answer is *Hem præceptor*. Our Grammar makes *hem* an Interjection of *disdaining*, which cannot suit that place. Some Dictionaries making it *adv. monstrantis*, which, it may be at some times, and yet used in a different manner, may be an *Interjection* too. Ibid. *Væ*, so far as I can find is generally taken for an *Interjection* of threatening,

threatning, and by some put in a distinct Class. Q. Whether it would not be plainer thus, some are of *threatning*, or *execration*, as *væ*, *malum*, or parted thus, *threatning*, as *væ*; *curſing*, as *malum*.

P. 39, 40. to 52. The ancient Pages altered *needlessly*, and unprofitably, nay to the hinderance of the Learner. What great use Paging the *Accidence* is of, I cannot tell: I think that little Book was full as well before, when it was not.

P. 45. *Ferrum habuit quo se occiderit*. It ever was 'till of late *occideret*, i. e. *occidere vellet*. How it came to be *occiderit*, and to continue in all Impressions for this long time I cannot think; for it seems to me to contradict the Sense of the *English*. Perhaps it might be to make it hit the *two* Signs of the *Preterperfect tense Potential*, but I do not look upon the signs of *that Mood* to be so certainly fix'd as the Signs of other *Moods* are. This may be an Ancient *Example*; nevertheless Q. Whether some other might not do better, such as, *hasta, quâ vulneravit hostem*. *Penna quâ scripsit literas*. *Tempus habet falcem, quâ mortales metit*. *Mors gerit Spiculum, quo transfigit homines*. But I make no great exception against the Example, so we can but have it as it used to be.

Ibid. Is not that called *Lutetia*, for, Is not that *Lutetia*? And under *Sum*, we have *meire* for *mejere*. *Quære hic*, Whether in *As in præſenti* it would not be better to be—*Vult mejo minxi*, and be a Spondaick Verse?

Gram. p. 115. But in former Grammars p. 51. *Alego nata, re, per, præ, sub, trans, ad præeunte*. Here *se* is well left out, and for the Preposition *ad*, we have not only a Participle from such a Compound, but also the Compound itself.

P. 117. ——— *dat quoque pinxi*

Pictum, strinxi strictum, rinxi vult quoque victum.

Q. Whether this be better than it was before? For my part I think it is much worse, and I do not believe that either *Cambridge* or *Oxford* ever attempted to make such an Alteration as this is.

P. 119. *Respuo, linguo, luo, metuo, cluo, frigeo, calveo*.
 P. 138. *Qui hodie quoque Senaculum appellatur*. P. 137. *Non est mentiri meum*. P. 142. *An utroque?* The two first of these perhaps may pass without exception, but what occasion there was for the other two Alterations I know not: I think *mentiri non est meum*, was much better: and the latter is quite contrary to the *Sense* of the *Rule*, because it puts a *Question* instead of an *Answer*.

P. 142. *Tanto tu pessimus* — This has been an old Error, which I think is neither good Verse, nor consistent with *Sense*: however very far from the Meaning and Writing of the *Author*. If the place be consulted, *tu* will not be found in the former Verse. This *Error* was corrected once, however it hath crept in again.

P. 144. *Dives equum*, it was ever before *Dives opum*. Various Readings sometimes prove not only *Useless*, but *Erroneous*; and I doubt not but if *opum* had been a fault, *Erasinus*, the Perfecter and Polisher of our *Syntax*, would have discovered it.

Ibid. Forma vel modus rei adjicitur nominibus, tum Substantivis tum Adjectivis, in ablativo. Q. Whether *tam* and *quam* were not better.

P. 148. *Uxorem de impudiciâ* — right undoubtedly:

P. 149. *Appendunt, Error Typographicus*, but which has past a many Impressions. *Plaut.* for *Plautus*, *ibid. intra*. This may seem not worth remarking: but it is a great Fault in this particular Place, and I know it to be So. I wish our *London Grammars* may hereafter be more conformable to the *Oxford* and *Cambridge Ones*, both which have it at large, here especially.

P. 151. *Dativum postulant verba composita cum Adverbiis bene, satis & malè; & cum, &c.* Here seems to me, one of the most useful Rules in the Grammar to be spoiled, and that most needlessly. In the *Accidence* indeed these words are mention'd, not so much for necessity as plainness for Children: but here the putting of 'em in spoils a good Rule, and all to no purpose; for Verbs compounded with these Adverbs do govern a *Dative case* plainly, by *Imprimis Verba Significantia commodum, &c.* and this used to be formerly

merly the *Latin* Rule given for such Verbs. If a Rule must be added for these *Verbs*, which I see no manner of occasion for, why may it not be subjoyned after *sum cum compositis*, and be a Rule by itself, as *Huc referuntur nomina ex Con præpositione* is? But I have not found any *Latin Grammarian* take notice of 'em; so needless was it judged, and so *comprehensive* were the Rules preceeding. Add still, they are Words that occur but seldom in Comparison of *Verbs* compounded with the *Prepositions* that follow, why then should they (being of little use and rare) take place of the *Prepositions* which are of great and frequent use? In short, I cannot see why they should be there at all.

P. 161. *His verò, Attinet, pertinet, spectat, propriè adduntur præpositiones Ad & In*: According to this Rule (which was a good Rule enough before the *Alteration*) it seems to me, That *either* of these *Prepositions*, one as well as the other, may be *indifferently* used after any of these *Impersonals*; a thing, which tho' it may happen sometimes, as *spectat ad orientem*, Plin. *Et in orientem spectat*, Cels. It lieth towards the East: yet I cannot believe that it will always prove right. For *spectat ad omnes bene vivere*, I suppose is better than *spectat in*. A little Imperfection therefore is better dispensed with, than Altering for the worse. The Grammar was very well before, when it said, *Quintil.* (sc. dixit) *pertinet in utramque partem*. Surely this Rule ought not to be alter'd: The Grammar is for Children, and therefore small *condescensional* Imperfections will become it. When *young* Scholars are grown up to be *learned* Men, they will then know right *Latin*, as well by *Practice*, as by *Rule*.

P. 162. *Stratòque super discumbitur ostro*. P. 164. *Mittitur Gylippus*.——The former I say little to, Tho' very learned Men retain the old, *Strato discumbitur ostro*: the latter I believe is right.

P. 162. *Ab hostibus constanter pugnatur*. This I believe should be *pugnatum*. Other *Grammarians* have it so; and our *Construing* Book seems to favour it, when it says, *Ab hostibus pugnatur*, the Enemies fought.

P. 168. *Post verba temporis*, for *timoris*. An old Error.

P. 170. *Item In accusativo jungitur*—This *Item In* did use to be *idem*, without a Point after it. *Idem*, q. d. *Idem In subauditum*.

P. 171. *Dixin'* pro *dixine*. This did use to be *dixtin'* pro *dixtine*.

P. 172. *Turba ruunt in me*—for *In me turba ruunt*—Whatever various reading may be, the old seems to me rather better than the new.

P. 174. *Rhemo cum fratre Quirinus Jura dabant*. In former Editions *Remus cum fratre Quirino*.—I am apt to think This change has been made upon account of *Romulus's* being elder Brother: but when I consider how frequently the Poets make use of Figures, I think, Why may not here be some *Anastrophe*, or *Hypallage*, or *Hysterologia*. Job says, 17. 4. *Thou hast hid their Heart from Understanding*, i. e. Thou hast hid Understanding from their Heart. So in *nutrit peperitque*, And *valet atque vivit*, it is plain what words ought to precede in Sense. I cannot tell what more to say to it at present. If it be a various Reading, I had rather err with the learned *Ancients*, than be led aside at every turn with *new Criticisms*.

P. 177. *Hic manus ob patriam*—It was formerly *Hæc* always. Such as have the Author may consult and judge.

P. 194. *Et Græca item per & vel &c diphthongum*. Here must be a manifest Error in putting in *evs*, none of the Examples having any relation to it.

There are more, but these are the chief *Alterations* I have taken notice of; I will now for the Peruser's Curiosity add, what *Alterations* I think might be made in the *Grammar*, without giving offence. And they are such as these.

1. To print the *Accidence* as formerly, if not in a fair black Letter, yet (as nigh as may be) the same quantity upon a Page.

2. To put in *Meridies*, and leave out all the forementioned *Alterations*, unless it be thought fit to put *Anima* before *Dea*; and after *liberta* these words, *and such like*, instead of such a long train.

3. In the *Tenses* (which tho' an admirable Contrivance) in the *Optative* Mood, instead of mentioning *God* so often in the English, and which we were always forbidden to do, because we should not take *God's* Name in vain, I could wish the *English* in every Tense were altered, thus, *I wish I love, O that I loved or did love, I wish I have loved, O that I had loved, I wish I love hereafter.*

In the *Potential* Mood I am of Mr. *Leeds's* opinion, that the two first *Tenses* for the generality are sufficient, and that *might* and *could* are Signs enow for a young Scholar to render in the preterimperfect Tense, it being sufficient that the rest have been mentioned in the *description* of the *Mood* before. What a *needless* burden is it to a young Child to have so many *Signs* to repeat with every Person?

After the present Tense Mr. *Hoole*, who in his *Accidence* makes choice of this *Mood* above the rest, (rejecting the rest indeed,) mentions but one *Sign*. Whether all the *Tenses* of this *Mood* and the *Optative* too (the two first excepted) might not be as well supplied by an useful Note or two, by which means some more room might be gained for the *Subjunctive* *Mood*, (which is the only *Mood* most use) that *Mood* wanting a larger space between its *Tenses*, is most proper for the *Masters* of our *great Schools* to judge. Time was when the *Potential Mood* was not at all, *Linacre* being the first Inventer of it; for which and other his singular exquisite Perfections in *Grammar*, he has been deservedly esteem'd: but a good thing may be esteemed too much, and carried farther than is needfull, as I am persuaded this *Mood* is in *Signs*, and that sometimes not very proper. However fewer *Signs* are enow in any reason for a Child to learn. So many are very discouraging, and all to no manner of purpose. What if the *Tenses* were contracted in their *Signs* and *English'd* thus, *I may or can love; I might or could love; I might have loved; I had, or should have loved; I may love hereafter?* One *Sign* that is for the generality proper, must needs be better than putting so many together, without considering whether they are proper, or not.

Omitting the *Subjunctive* Mood, which is the only Mood (as before said) that most use, I come next to the future Tense of *Sum*, which in all our Grammars of late, in the 1st and 2d Person plural, has got a long Mark upon it, thus, *erimus, eritis*, and this I look upon as a very gross Fault. *Smetius*, in his *Prosodia*, will shew 'em very good Authority for their being Short; and I wish, for the time to come, they may be so Mark'd, to make Satisfaction for what is past. *Potential Mood of Sum*. *Fuerim, I might have been*; *Fuissem, I should have been*.

In ancient Grammars, excepting at *Verbs*, have four Conjugations, long Syllables in the Tenses were circumflex'd.

In the *Indicative Mood Passive*, there are too many Braces to the *Preterperfect* and *Preterpluperfect* Tenses; so that they make it difficult for Children to learn. There are only two Braces to these Tenses in the *Optative*, *Potential* and *Subjunctive* Moods, which makes those Tenses much fairer. If it be objected, the *Latin* and *English* both, cannot be got in otherwise. I answer, it may, by taking away the third Brace, and setting the *English* after the first Person thus, *amatus sum vel fui*, I have been loved, *tus es vel fuisti*, &c. Mr. *Dugard*, in his *English Rudiments* of the *Latin Tongue*, generally makes but one Brace, and for the Answer to it, a straight perpendicular Line. *Danes* makes but one Brace, after the first Person, and very handsome and plain it looks. And here note further, concerning the passive Voice, that where the Person is double, The *Oxford Grammar* puts *vel* in small Letters, and some Grammars sometimes use only an *v.* for *vel*: so that I conclude, it may be done one way or other, and so render the Tenses more uniform. The *Oxford Grammar* of the third Edition, has these Tenses sweetly printed, like those in the *Subjunctive Mood*.

At *irregular Verbs*, I think it would be much better, if the *Subjunctive Mood*, with *cum*, were put instead of the *Optative* and *utinam*: not only *Dugard*, but *Danes* and *Bird*, and all others that I have seen, do so. The Rule following may be easily altered thus, The *Optative* and *Potential* Moods are formed like the *Subjunctive* in voice, &c.

Mr.

Mr. Bird, in his *Grammar*, puts the *English* of *possum* before every Tense, *I am able*; *I was able*; *I have been able*; *I had been able*; *I shall or will be able*: And this may be easily done in our *Grammar*, in the *Indicative* Mood especially; for on the second Page of that Mood, there is a great deal of spare room, which, if used, would make way for such a thing doing. And why shall not Children have *Learning* made as easy to 'em as well may be? The doing of this, in the *Indicative* Mood, would make it less needful in the Moods following.

The *Concords* and *English* Rules I could wish were printed as much on a Page, as did use to be in former Times, or at least as the *Cambridge* Grammar has them, which differs but in two or three Places, and that very little.

Under the third Concord Mr. Hoole observes, that *Imperium & dignitas quæ petiisti* is an Example, that does not fitly answer to the Rule; but rather to the next that followeth. He gives an Example that does fit the Rule, and many other such might be made, as *agnus & ovicula quos emi*; *gallus & gallina quos misi*; *phasianus & phasiana quos domum attuli*; *Leo & læna quos effugi*; *cygnus & aquila vos vidi*: but because it may be hard to hit the Rule with an Example that will please all, what if the Rule were left without any Example at all, and *Imperium & dignitas* put to the former part of the next Rule, and then *Tea*, and in such a Case, to follow without a breach of the Paragraph?

In the Grammar-Part.

Pag. 2. According as the Grammar was Paged formerly. Before *Risariam pinguntur literæ*; These Rules,

C ante *e*, *i*, & *y* molliter pronunciari solet, fere ut *S*; ut *certus*, *cicer*, *cyathus*: alibi duriter ut *k*; ut *calamus*, *cor*, *amicus*.

Similiter *g* pronunciamus ante *e* & *i* molliter, veluti *jod*; ut *age*, *egi*; aliàs duriter ut Græcorum *γ*; ut *gaudium*, *gloria*.

T cum *i* ante vocalem liquescit, & sonat *Si*; ut *oratio*, *patientia*: nisi in Græcis dictionibus, si Græco more pronun-

nuncientur, ut *politia*; vel initio dictionis, ut *tiara*; aut in Infinitivo poetico, ut *mittier* pro *mitti*; aut denique præcedente S, ut *quæstio*, *tristior*.

I know what great Out-cries are made, by such as exceed in Criticising, against these Letters having a changeable Sound, and how positively they affirm, The *ancient Romans* did not pronounce so, even as if they had lived in their Times: But why might not the *Romans* as well change the *Potestas* of some Letters a little, as the *Greeks* and *Hebrews*? 'Tis well known γ has not always the same Sound in *Greek*, and that several Letters in *Hebrew* sometimes include an *asperate*, and sometimes not. Besides, because we cannot *accent* all words as the *Latines* did, must we therefore not *accent* as well as we can, and according as the Custom is, and has been for many Hundred Years?

If it be objected, This will displace and disorder the Print. I answer, I think it need not; for if the *Literæ majusculæ* be put into Lines, perhaps there may be room for some necessary addition to the *Numerals*, which Account falls far short of what many other Grammars give. e. g.

In numeris verò Significant, I *unum*, V *quinque*, X *decem*, L *quingenta*, C *centum*, CC vel CC *ducentos*, ID vel D *quingentos*, ∞, CIO vel M *mille*, IDO *quinque millia*, CCIDO *decem millia*, IDOO *quingenta millia*, CCCIDOO *centena millia*, IDOOO *quingenta millia*, CCCCIDOOO *decies centena millia*.

Minor numerus præpositus tantundem demit majori sequenti; postpositus verò tantundem addit: ut IV valet *quatuor*, VI verò *sex*; IX valet *novem*, at XI *undecim*.

Linea transversa notis numericis superposita, easdem tot millia continere innuit, quot alioqui minores numeros continerent, ut III *tria millia*, X *decem millia*, & sic de cæteris.

In *Syllabarum distinctionibus*, and *Orthoëpia*, some Alterations may very well be made for the better, and thereby some room obtain'd for other Rules of more use. For Instance, after *aptè distinguere atque connectere*,

No-

Notandum igitur quod

1. Consona inter duas vocales posita pertinet ad posteriorem; ut, *a-mor*.

2. Si consonans geminetur, prior ad præcedentem, posterior ad sequentem Syllabam pertinet; ut, *an-nus*.

3. Consonæ, quæ in initio vocis conjungi non possunt, in medio sunt distinguendæ; ut, *sul-cus*.

4. Consonæ, quæ in initio vocis conjungi possunt, in medio non sunt distinguendæ; ut, *no-ster*.

• Then in *Simplicibus vocibus*, *b d*, &c.

Quam quidem rationem sequuntur & ista; *et*, ut *do-ctus*, *fan-ctus*, &c. where a little lower we have, *di-scis*, for *pi-scis*.

5. Quo modo syllabæ vocis primitivæ dividuntur, ita & derivatæ; ut, quia *Te-go*, ergo & *Te-gmen*: quia *Do-ceo*, ergo *do-ctior*, *do-ctrina*, &c.

Hæc autem difficilis distinguendi syllabarum ratio tenellis legere discentibus non est conveniens.

6. In compositis quæque pars ab alterâ separanda est; ut *trans-eo*, *sus-tuli*, *abs-trusus*.

Inter *m* & *n*, &c. seems of little use.

Post *x* non scribitur *s*, is not a true Rule. Post *x* scribitur *s*, vel non scribitur, prout euphonia dirigit; ut *exscribo*, *exsolvo*: Aliquando autem inseritur vel omittitur *s* indifferenter, ut *exsequor*, & *exequor*; *exequiæ* & *exsequiæ*, *exsul* & *exul*, sed *exsolvo* tantum. Here I beg leave to add a short Observation from the Letter *x* in *Littleton's Dictionary*. *S* post *x* omitti debere contendit *Priscianus*, quod Græcè *ἐκ* non *ἐξ* ante *σ* scribatur, & quia *x* loco *c* & *s* fungitur; ergo *exequor* scribendum, non *exsequor*. At hinc sequeretur potius scribi debere *ecsequor*, quo modo antiquitus scriptum, &c.

In compositis cum præpositione auribus & euphoniæ serviendum est; ut, *occurro*, *officio*, *aufero*; non *obcurro*, *obficio*, *abfero*. At è contra, *abstineo*, *obtineo*, *obrepo*, sine ullâ præpositionis mutatione. This need not be put in Braces. The third Edition of the *Oxford Grammar* is very fine, and particularly remarkable for taking away needless Braces.

At *Orthoëpia*. Q. Whether these Alterations might not be made without loss, or harm.

The Five Lines from *Nostrati vulgo* to *Ischnotes* to be left out; and the Four Lines for Examples to *Ischnotes* to be unbraced, and contracted thus, ut cum pro *nunc, nunc*; pro *aliquis, aliquis* proferimus.

At *plateasmus* the Braces to be taken away, and the Examples to follow thus, ut cum pro *ergò, sperma, perago*, efferimus *argò, sparma, parago*; pro *montes, mountes*; pro *tibi, taibi*. All the rest as far as *H* to be rejected. What Corruptions in pronunciation might be in former times is now unknown: but were a Child to be sent to a Latin-School now, and pronounce after this manner, he would be more fit to be sent back to learn his Letters again, and Spelling, than to be put forward in Latin, for a Beginning to which, reading English well is the best Foundation.

The Examples to *H* to be put in Lines thus, Malè *ergò*, pro *Homo, hamus, humus, Christus, Chrisma, Chremes*, efferimus *omo, amus, umus, Cristus, Crisma, Cremes, &c.*

Amath, caputh, &c. to be put in Lines, and the Braces taken away. The 3^d Edition of the *Oxford Grammar* (I find) puts 'em all away.

At *Casus Nominum* mention is made under *Dativus* of an Eighth Case: Being solicitous to know the Reason of it, I desir'd some Years ago a learned and ingenious young Gentleman, Mr. *Henry Bland*, Gentleman-Commoner of *C. C. College Oxon.* to search the *old Grammarians* for me, and send me an account concerning it, which he very kindly did, as follows,

Maximus Victorinus. Ars Grammatica. De Casibus.

Septimus casus est, qui quasi Speciem *ablativi* habet, nec tamen *ablativus* est; quippe ipse per *accusativum* lucidiùs explicatur: veluti cum dicimus, *Nos terrâ vel mari vectos*; non utique à *Terrâ vel mari*, sed per *terram vel mare*. Pag. 1939. Edit. *Putschianâ*.

Sergius in Donati Editionem Secundam. De Casibus.

Octavus casus fit, cum quod per *accusativum* cum præpositione possumus dicere, dicimus per *Dativum* sine præpositione: ut, *clamor it in cælum, & clamor it cælo*. Editione *Putschianâ*, Pag. 1844. That

That *Octavus casus* should be put in, and no mention made of *Septimus*, seems to be a sign of *human Imperfection*: and whether it may be proper to take any Notice of either of them, may deserve the Consideration of such *learned Persons*, as the Care and Examination of our *Grammar* properly belongs to. If the Number of Cases be to be multiply'd beyond a *necessary Termination* of them, and the Cases to take their Number from the *various Signification* of Prepositions, the Sense of which may be therein imply'd, I am very well satisfy'd we should find their Number strangely increas'd.

In *Propria quæ maribus*, *Quæ genus*, and *As in præsentî*, some little Imperfections may be suffer'd to pass, and if any thing be altered *there*, it must be sparingly. For, so much as it is difficult in Verse (tho' useful for Beginners) to represent the *Genders of Nouns* without Exception taking; and our *Foresathers* have been cautious of presuming to make the least Alteration in our excellent Establish'd *Grammar*, I hope therefore it will be granted, that too much *Criticising* ought not to be allow'd in a thing so *Sacred* as our *Grammar* is; yet having made this Beginning, I pray I may be born with a little further, and may have leave to offer some Questions.

Q. 1. Whether *Fustis funis*—were not better thus, *Sic Fustis, funis, sic panis, crinis & ignis*?—Or thus, *Fustis, funis, panis, crinis, mugilis, ignis*. The old Verse has often been found fault with, for a Word that is seldom met with.

Q. 2. *Est neutrum hippomanes*—What it thus,

Est neutrum panaces, cacoëtbes, hippomanesque

Nepenthes, pelagus:—or thus,

Nepenthes, panaces, cactë:bes, hippomanesque

Neutra quoque, & pelagus; vulgus modo mas, modo neutrum.

Sic invariable nomen may serve for a Rule for *vinus*, a word seldom met with, as well as it does for *melos* and *chaos*, Words of more common use.

I have read in a good Author *panacis genus*, concerning a certain Herb, and I put *vulgus modo mas, modo neutrum*, rather than as it is, because Children must decline the Masculine before the Neuter.

Q. 3. What if *halcyonis* and *restis* were left out, they being both excepted against? and the supply made thus, *Et rubus, & libanus*—Or, *Atque rubus, libanus, finis, clunis, penus, amnis*, Tho' some foreign *Grammarians* take *halcyonis* for a Nominative Case, and of the doubtful Gender; and if so, thus, *Halcyonis, libanus, finis, clunis*.

The *Notes* upon *restis*, say, *Restis* femininum est. Dictionaries I find vary about it. What can be done in such a case as this, unless it be to choose words of the most Use, and most worthy of Observation, and leave the rest for *Commentators*?

Q. 4. Whether *mulier* might be left out after such a manner as this? — *Attamen ex his*

Sunt ritè muliebre genus, Jyren, soror, uxor.

Q. 5. What if *Ut bisfrons* were thus,

Ut bisfrons; fur, sus, bos, custos, atque sacerdos?

Q. 6. Whether *Bacchar* and *Gorgon* might not be left out, and the Verse thus, *Hálquecyon, mulier, findon, icon, & Amazon?* or only *Gorgon*, and so thus, *sic mulier, bacchar, findon, &c.*

In the Declensions, p. 22. *Hæc dativos, &c.* *Anima* is here wanting, and some other words, which are more proper for this place than the Accidence. *Anima, domina, dea, mula, asina, equa, liberta, famula, serva, conserva, socia, ambæ, duæ, abus.*

Os facit *on* in Accusativo; ut *Delos, Delon*: sed *Attica* in *os*, genitivum in *o* mittunt, & accusativum in *on* per *o*: ut—

Before *Notabis*, what if these Rules were inserted?

Nomina in *us* faciunt vocativum in *e*; ut *Dominus, & Domine. Excipe Deus, ô Deus, & filius, ô fili.*

Nomina propria in *ius* faciunt vocativum in *i*; ut, *Mercurius, Mercuri; Terentius, Terenti; Gregorius, Gregori, &c.*

Nomina tamen appellativa & adjectiva in *ius*, faciunt vocativum in *e*; ut, *Tabellarius, Tabellarie; Pius, Pie.*

Then *Notabis autem Latina quædam, &c.* after which Neutra tres casus habent similes, Nominativum, Accusativum, & vocativum; & in plurali desinunt in *a*.

Festorum

Festorum Nomina misplaced, and some other Exceptions hereafter will be taken Notice of in the Omissions following.

At the End of the Declensions.

De Nominibus inter se compositis.

Si nomen à duobus rectis componatur, uterque declinabitur; ut, *jusjurandum, jurisjurandi; Respublica, reipublicæ.* Excipiuntur autem, *alteruter, alterutrius; Leopardus, leopardi; Rosmarinus, rosmarini;* Et numeralia cum *duo* composita; ut *duodecimus, duodevigessimus.*

Si verò Rectus obliquo copuletur, rectus tantum variabitur; ut *paterfamiliās, patrisfamiliās, Jurisconsultus, jurisconsulti; triumvir, triumviri.*

Whether such Rules as these would be useful, I leave it to others to judge; I think it not material to contend about them: besides it may be difficult to make 'em Unexceptionable; for Dr. *Sydenham* in his Medicinal Prescriptions has *rorismarini.* Some add *olus-atrum.*

Questions in *Quæ genus.*

Q. 1. If *ditionis* have a Nominative Case, Whether may not *primoris* be put in its place?

Q. 2. *Quæ referunt*—*Quæ* to be put a little further into the Line, and to begin as it were a new Section, against *Defectiva Vocativa* in the Margent, to make a little stronger Pause as it were, and so be the more taken notice of. And what if the same were done at *Nundinum*, and *Istis multa solent*? But not to separate 'em from the Rules they are subjoyn'd to.

Q. 3. Instead of *Menses profluvium*—Whether *Annales, gemini, procures, fasti, &c.*—might not be more useful Examples? Abundance of words belonging to this Rule, and it serving for all, express'd or understood, Why may not the most useful be preferr'd?

P. 34. The *Anomalous* Comparisons, tho' well done, might be something mended, but the Imperfection is very little, and not unbecoming. What is sinful and offensive to mention, that is always to be avoided. Therefore the last Rule I could wish were alter'd thus, or to this effect.

Interdum autem à substantivis—Sed abusivè, ut *Pærior à Pæno* ; *Neronior à Nerone*. Meliùs autem dicitur, *Cruelior Nerone*, quàm *Neronior* ; Et *perfidior Pæno*, quàm *Pærior*.

Some Grammarians take no manner of notice of this Rule, and indeed I think it is not much worth while : Why should bad Examples be put in Grammar, especially when they are useless. The late good Mr. *Hoole*, in his *Grammatical Attempt*, approved by Bp *Sanderson*, has laid down the Rule thus, *Interdum etiam à substantivis fit comparatio, sed abusivè ; ut Nero, Neronior ; Pænus, Pærior*. Long may a Man read, before he meets with any of these words, and when he does they are hateful, and of no use : And why should the *Grammar* (which is intended for Children chiefly) be needlessly clogg'd with any bad Example ? *Nil dictu fædum, visive hæc limina tangat.*

Intra quæ puer est. Juv. I would have the whole *Grammar* (as much as possible) be without Offence, for Children's sakes, if it were for nothing else.

Questions in *As in præsentî*.

Q. Whether *Spondeo habere sponsondi*, And *apiscor Quod vetus est verbum eptus sum*, be not inveterate Faults, first occasion'd and introduced by the Ignorance, or Negligence of our *Correctors*, and slothfully let pass, by all the Masters of our great Schools ever since ? *Sponsondi* the Preter-tense is used in the *Latin Bible*, and often in *Suetonius*, if I mistake not ; and moreover, Verse will not allow of *Sponsondi* : And for *apiscor*, it does as regularly make *aptus*, as the compound does *adeptus*. *Aptus*, gotten, is used by *Varro*.

I look upon both these Two as gross Faults, and easily corrected : a few other exceptionable Particulars (because little) I think are better passed by than taken notice of. But there is a marginal Observation not to be passed by, upon the last Page, viz. *Desiderativa, ut micturio, &c.* I cannot perswade my self, that ever all these words were fairly put in. What if the Margent were thus, *Med. i. e. desiderativa, quæ vide supra ?*

Some have pretended the Defects in *As in præsentî* were too many to be supply'd, and therefore have presented us with a new *Scheme*, which *Scheme* wants not its Faults. Fain would I know, why *como*, *promo*, *sumo*, *demo* & *temno*, with their Compounds, should make their *Pretertenses* and *Supines* without a *p*, contrary to *Custom*, *Euphony*, and the *Judgment* of *Priscian*. This *over-criticising* is of as bad consequence sometimes, as the want of being *critical* enough. A late Author has followed this Outlandish *Scheme*, thinking thereby to render *As in præsentî* useless; a thing which I hope will never be effected in any Age, they are such *fine Rules* to Partle by. For what can be more easy to a Scholar, than as he declines *amo*, to be asked, Why *amavi*? Why *amatum*? And with what *understanding*, *pleasure* and *readiness* may he answer, and give the Rules?

P. 72. For *Syntaxis* and *Figura*, I think they may be sooner *marr'd* than *mended*. Some *Alterations* have been made, according to *Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses*, but I suppose with great Caution. The two Examples about *Erasmus* have undoubtedly been put in since. Some late *Grammarians* have put in several Parts of Speech together into one Rule, all to govern such a Case by that Rule, a Fault excellently avoided in our *Grammar*, 'till of late *benè*, *satis* & *malè* have been very badly and most needlessly obtruded.

And for *Figura*, it need not all be taught; many Observations in it, being capable of Preterition, without harm done, a *Specimen* of which we have in *Leed's* first *Examples*.

Syntaxis.

Syntax being divided into *Concord* and *Government*, there seems to me to be wanting before *Verbum personale*, between the two last Sentences, *viz.* at the End of the former, some such words as these, *Cujus partes sunt duæ*, *Concordantia* & *Regimen*. This I think will be a little necessary Explication of all the *Syntax* following, and will require no manner of Alteration further in that respect.

Q. Whe-

Q. Whether *vos damnastis*, which is the Example under *Causâ discretionis*, in the manner it is there used, be not as proper an Example for *Emphasis gratiâ*. In an old *Lilie's Grammar*, I have seen, it was, *Nos accusavimus, vos damnastis*. If it had been *excusavimus*, I should have liked it better. Some have this, *Ego ejeci, vos introducitis*. Many such Examples might be adapted to the Rule, as *Nos perduravimus, vos fugistis*. *Nos certavimus vobiscum*, at *vos vicistis*: But if we have proper and fit Examples, we must stick to 'em, and not be fond of every Variation which others choose. If it be objected, That the Examples under *Emphasis gratiâ* are a vehement Repetition of the same word, and *vos damnastis* is not so, I rest satisfied, tho' I think some other Examples might do as well.

Non est mentiri meum; it was ever formerly, *Mentiri non est meum*; much better in my Thoughts, and easier for a Child to explain and understand.

Te fabulam agere volo, and *ut tu fabulam ages, volo*, tho' very fit Examples to their respective Rules, yet because the matter they contain is not allowable, ought therefore I think to be changed. Some use *Te bene sperare volo*, and *ut tu bene speres, volo*. Very good Examples in my Thoughts, and useful.

Rara avis in terris, nigroque simillima cygno, Mr. Hoole adds to this *Vera fides*.

Non hoc primum pectora vulnus—Q. Whether *pectora* and *graviora* should not be with two Capitals?

Relativum inter duo antecedentia, for *inter duo substantiva*. This must be allow'd for an Error, I think. The English Rule is, When a *Relative* cometh between *two Substantives* of divers Genders.

Q. Whether after *Casus relativi* it would not be proper to add this rule, *Interrogativa & indefinita relativi more insuuntur*, or some such like Observation.

Luc. de Cat. Q. Whether this should not be *Lucanus de Catone*, and as long as there is room for it, Why should it not be set at large?

Fu tunc accusas, an homicidii? an utroque? So it is now printed: but *an* was never put there formerly: it is indeed

indeed quite contrary to the Rule, for instead of answering, it asks a Question, which in that place it ought not to do.

Tanto tu pessimus omnium poëta, &c. This is an old Error, but a very great one, *tu* not only spoiling the Verse, but the Sense: for the Poet's meaning is, That he (sc. himself) was by so much the worst of Poets, as his Patron was the best of Patrons. So that *tu* in the former Line ought to be left out: Once it was left out, but it is now brought in again.

At fessæ multâ referunt se nocte minores;

Crura thymo plenæ. Here are two Faults in our common Grammars, *Crura* put at the end of the Line, which ought to begin the next, and *plena* for *plenæ*.

So *dives equum*, for *dives opum*; and *haud unquam indignus*, for *haudquaquam indignus avorum*. Let others admire these Variations, I do not.

Æqui, boni consulo, &c. with a Point between 'em.

Ipsium hunc orabo, &c. Why is not this Example printed in a Line by it self, as it is in the *Oxford-Grammar*? If it had, it would have prevented a Fault in Orthography.

Dativum postulant verba composita cum adverbis bene, satis & male, & cum his præpositionibus, &c. Here, in the first place, one of the most useful Rules in the Grammar is spoiled, by putting *Adverbs* and *Prepositions* together in one Rule, which is a thing quite contrary to the Method of the Grammar, and very inconvenient in Parsing. Again, Q. Whether there needs any particular Rule for these Adverbs, and whether the Verbs they are compounded with, be not referable to *Imprimis verba significantia commodum*. Lastly, If there must be a Rule for them, what if it were placed after *Sunt cum compositis*, after this manner? *Composita cum satis, bene, male* postulant dativum; ut, *Satisfecit expectationi nostræ. Benefecit multis. Malefecit nulli.* And then *Dativum postulant*: as it used to be formerly.

Rogandi verba interdum mutant alterum accusativum in ablativum: here is wanting *cum præpositione*; and *ipsi obtestemur* are marked with *a* and *b* for Explanation of the

the Rule; for what reason I know not, unless it be to create a needless trouble to Children: but this is of long standing.

Q Whether *Passivorum Constructio*, and *Infinitivorum Constructio*, which are placed in the Margent, would not be better, if placed in a Line before the Rules that follow them. My meaning is, Whether, if it were so, the Rules following would not be more obvious to Children, and this may be done without beginning the Rules with great Capitals.

Ab hostibus constanter pugnatur, for *pugnatum* the preterperfect Tense: so it is in a Learned foreign *Grammatician*, and our Construing-book gives the English in that Tense.

Cedò flagitantis exhiberi, &c. What if it were, *Cedò, flagitantis aliquem aliquid*, or *Cedò, adverbialiter positum*? Very severe Censures have I read upon this Word and *inflar*, but they are not worth regarding.

Abstinuerunt à viris. Whom this can relate to, unless it be the *Amazons*, I cannot think, no Author is quoted for it. Mr. Hoole has it, *Abstine à vitiis*. What if it were, *Probi abstinent à vitiis*; or, *abstinendum est à vitiis*? or, *abstine ab irâ*.

At *Apocope*, we have *dixin'* pro *dixine*, This ever formerly was *dixtin'* pro *dixtine*.

Turba ruunt in me—for *In me turba ruunt*—Whatever various Reading may be, the old seems to me rather better than the New.

Q Whether at the end of *Figura* after *copiosè differentem*, it might not be of use to add, *hæ tamen breves Regulæ sequentes interim notari possunt*.

1. *Eclipsis*, sive *Ellipsis* est dictionis ad legitimam constructionem necessariæ defectus; ut, *Cùm in animo haberet navigandi*: Sc. *voluntatem*, Cic. *Quamvis ei secundas ferè Grammaticorum consensus deferat*: Sc. *partes*. Quintil. *Tantânnue rem tam negligenter agere*? Subintelligitur oportebat. Ter. *Vulnerantur amplius sexcenti*, pro *amplius quàm sexcenti*, Cæsar.

Cujuslibet partis Orationis interdum fit *Eclipsis*. Nominis; ut, *pauca loqui*, sc. *verba*. Præpositionis; ut, *præ quod tu velis*, i. e. *præ eo quod*. Verbi; ut, *Rari quippe boni*, sc. *Sunt*. Participii; ut, *Ingenio auctore*, nempe *existente*. Adverbii; ut, *vereor ne possit*, Subauditur *non*. Conjunctionis; ut, *velim suspicias*, Subauditur *ut*. Præpositionis; ut, *Despiciente æthere summo*, i. e. *ex æthere*. Interjectionis; ut, *me miserum*, i. e. *heu me miserum*.

II. *Pleonasmus* est cum una pluresve dictiones in oratione redundant; ut *Sic ore locuta est*. Virg. *Hisce oculis egomet vidi*. Ter.

III. *Enallage* est & vocum, & quorundam earum accidentium immutatio, puta casuum, generum, modorum, temporum & numerorum. I. Vocum, quæ & partis dicitur; ut *scire tuum*, pro *scientia*, Perf. *Sole recens orto*, pro *recenter*, Virg. II. Casuum; ut, *non audet hominem id ætatis monere*, pro *ejus ætatis*, Cic. *Cui nunc cognomen Julo*, pro *Julus*, Virg. *Vix audior ulli* pro *ab ullo*. *Inferretque Deos Latio*, pro *in Latium*. *It clamor cælo*, pro *ad cælum*. *Adsis lætitiæ Bacchus dator*, pro *Bacche*. *Projice tela manu sanguis meus*, pro *sanguis mi*. Virg. *Heu me, pater insidiis oppresse jaces*, pro *oppressus*, Sen. *Venis expectate*, pro *expectatus*, Virg. *Hæret pede pes*, pro *pedi*. Idem. III. Generum; ut *nube gravidâ candicante quod tempestatem albam vocant*. *Bellantur* pro *bellant*; passivum genus pro activo. IV. Temporum; ut *vicimus*, pro *vincemus*. V. Modorum; ut, *valebis*, pro *vale*. *Expectabis* pro *expecta*. Sic *adferre*, & *dicere*, pro *adferebat* & *dicebat*. *Græcus gaudio stupere*, pro *stupebat*. VI. Numerorum; ut, *Dedimus operam*, pro *dedi*.

IV. *Hellenismus*, sive *Græcismus*, est Græci sermonis non Latini imitatio; ut, *abstine irarum*, Hor. pro *ab ira*. *Desine mollium tandem querelarum*, id. *Venit petere*, pro *petitum*. *Misit orare*, pro *oratum*. Sic *nigræ lanarum*, pro *nigræ læne*. *Sero diei*, pro *sero die*. *Opaca locorum*, pro *opaca loca*. *Cunctas terrarum*, pro *cunctas terras*.

V. *Archaismus* est vetus & jam obsoletus loquendi modus; ut *absente nobis*, pro *absentibus*. *Tam nulli consilii sum*, pro *nullius*. *Quid tibi hanc rem curatio est?* *Functus est officium*, pro *officio*. *Operam abutitur*, pro *operâ*.

Archaismos notare, non imitari debemus; eorum magnus est apud Autores priscos numerus, & frequens usus.

In *Prosodia*.

The Accents seem to want some farther Explanation, as thus, or to this effect: *Acutus* acuit vel attollit syllabam, & est virgula obliqua, &c. *Gravis* gravat five deprimit syllabam, & notatur virgulâ obliquâ descendente in dextram, adhuc modum (^). *Circumflexus* tardat syllabam, eamque longiore morâ effert, pariter attollens cum acuto, & deprimens cum gravi, & componitur ex utrisque, hoc modo (^).

Acutus superponitur ambiguis, differentię causâ; ut, *occido*: concisis, quæ tonum retinent integræ dictionis; ut, *Virgili*, pro *Virgilii*: Et syllabis encliticis, *que*, *ne*, *ve* præcedentibus.

Gravis superducitur adverbis, quæ distinguenda sunt ab adjectivis; ut *doctè*. Et interdum præpositionibus transpositis; ut, *Transstra pèr & remos*, Virg. ubi accentus *transstra* videtur in *pèr* devolvi.

Circumflexus superadditur ambiguis; ut, *occido*: Contractis; ut, *Deum* pro *Deorum*; *amâsse* pro *amavisse*. Item ablativis singularibus primæ, & genitivis quartæ declinationis; ut, *musâ*, *manûs*.

—*Non enim* composita sunt, *Quære*, Whether it should not be, *etenim* or *namque*.

—*Cathedra, mediocris*. Producentur autem *unius*, *illius*, & similia.

After *Res est solliciti*—*Quære*, Whether this might be properly added, *Versus pentameter* est rarissimè solitarius, sed *hexametro* junctus efficit carmen *Elegiacum*, lugubribus rebus & miseris imprimis aptum. *Horace* says,

*Versibus impariter junctis querimonia primum,
Post etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos.*

Innuba, *pronuba*, &c. to be put in Lines, and *Et quedam alia* added; for there be more such words, such as *perfidus*, *causidicus*, *imbēcillus*.

The next Observation I make, is against *Cercyra* being put amongst words which have the first Syllable *commune*. A Vowel before a Mute, a Liquid following, may be *commune*; but here is the quite contrary, a Liquid before a Mute. I have often wonder'd this should pass so long. *Hoole* makes it *Cosyra*, with *s*, and so the *Cambridge Grammar* has it, but what *Poet* used it I know not. Q. Whether this Rule might not be properly added, which I take to be a true one, viz. *Atque hic notetur, & primas & medias syllabas in nominibus propriis, nisi natura syllabæ repugnet, à poetis sæpe variari.*

N finita producantur; ut, *Pæan, Hymen, Xenophon, quin, non.* Mr. *Hoole* has it thus, *N* finita producantur, ut *Pæan, Hymen, non.* Sure it is Folly to add words there is no need of. So before, in *Propria quæ maribus, Canon, Architecton, Philemon*, might be Examples sufficient for the Rule.

Lastly, As for words ending in *y*, which some *critical Grammarians* conclude with, I think it is not worth while to take notice of them. They are *Greek* words, and I think but *two* in all, and out of the way of Children, and so rarely met with, that the Rule may as well be enquired for out of the *Greek Grammar*, to which they properly belong. If this do not satisfy, 'tis easy adding after *diu: Excipienda tamen sunt Græca u tenui terminata*; ut, *Tiphy, moly*; or some such like words, but the *Grammar* has ever done well enough without.

Some more OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. *Dugard*, in his *English Rudiments*, after the Capital and Small Letters, and some few Rules concerning them, lays down some short Rules concerning the Notes or Points used in the distinguishing of Writing, thus,

1. A *Comma*, which is a short Pause—,
2. A *Semicolon*, something longer—;
3. A *Colon*, a long Stay---
4. A *Period*, which makes up a perfect Sentence—.
5. A Note of *Exclamation*—!
6. A Note of *Interrogation*—?
7. A *Parenthesis*—().

I cannot think but such an Addition as this, at the Bottom of the first Page, under the Letters, would be of much more use than the *Greek Alphabet*. 'Tis true, there are Rules for Pointing in the *Latine Grammar*, but 'tis to be doubted, but few heed them.

Homo is a Name common to all Men. It always used to be, *Homo* is a common Name to all Men. I take notice of this, because I would have no needless Changes made. I think no Alterations ought to be made in the *Established Grammar*, unless it be Correcting a manifest Fault, and sometimes not that.

Some ancient Editions of the *Grammar*, have *Amo* in the Beginning of the *Indicative Mood* with a small Capital, the second and third Persons of all the *Conjugations* standing exactly under one another, in a perpendicular Rank, which looks very fine: the same likewise in the *Passive*, but not quite so perpendicular. The *Tenses* are not so fairly and neatly Printed now as formerly.

Of the *preterperfect Tense* of the *Indicative Mood* be formed, &c. *quare hic*, Whether the word *Tense* be not Three times needlessly repeated, and the word *Mood* twice, and whether such Repetition does not rather tend to obscuring the Rule, than illustrating it, and consequently be a hindrance to a Child's understanding of it.

There be four Kinds of *Participles*, &c. Certainly after this Rule, the *Participles* are not methodically placed. Without doubt, respect was had to the *active* and *passive* Voice in placing of 'em so as they are; and tho' this may be allow'd for a Reason, yet it ought to give way, when there is a stronger Reason against it. How pleasant and easy will it be for a Child, to learn them in such Order as at first plac'd! A *Participle* of the *present Tense*, hath his English ending in *ing*, &c. A *Participle* of the *preter Tense*, hath his English ending in *d*, *t*, or *n*, &c. A *Participle* of the *future* in *rus* betokeneth to *do*, like the *infinitive* Mood of the *active* Voice, &c. And a *Participle* of the *future* in *dus* betokeneth to *suffer*, like the *infinitive* Mood of the *passive* Voice. This must be the most natural Order. Mr. Bird, Mr. Danes, Mr. Hoole, and the
 Author

Author of the Royal Grammar Reform'd, do all place 'em so. Learned Men all, and famous School-masters in their Time. Mr. Paul P. Jasz-Berenyi, a *Transylvanian Gentleman* (who, with several other Learned Men of his Country, fled into *England*, in the time of dreadful Wars, which laid waste their Country, and burn'd their Libraries) he in his *Grammatical Institutions*, places 'em in the natural order. His Works, and Dr. *Sylvan's* upon *Isocrate's* Orations ad *Demonicum*, and *Nicoclem* have let the World see, that there are very Learned Men in remote Parts of the World, as well as these.

Again, I do consider, that in the *forming* or *conjugating* of Verbs, after we have done with the *active* Voice by itself, and the *passive* by itself, and come to form the two Voices together, as *amo*, I love, *amor*, I am loved, and come to the Participles, we always say, *amans* loving, *amatus* loved: *amaturus* to love, or about to love, *amandus* to be loved.

To be excessively strict any way is to spoil all: At this rate we must cast out the *latter Supin* out of the *active* Voice: and when this is done, where shall it be placed so well?

Festorum nomina, under *Tertia declinatio*, is placed in the middle of Rules for the *Ablative Case*, very improperly. Mr. *Hoole* places it the last of Rules under the *Genitive Case* plural. Mr. *Walker* also, in his *Art of Teaching Improv'd*, places it much after the same manner.

At *Neutra, quorum*, &c. in the Margent is wanting *Nominativus pluralis*.

Sunt & quæ syncopen—What if *serpentum* were left out, and some other Examples more useful inserted, such as *agrestum* pro *agrestium*, *cælestum* pro *cælestium*.

Alitum ab *ales* assumit *u*, & *cælitum* à *cælites*.

Q. What if before *Boum*, were inserted some such Rule as this? *Quædam modo in ium, modo in um apud Autores reperiuntur; ut, paludium, paludum, fornacium, fornacum, volucrium, volucrum.*

Feminina in o, Quære, Whether there should be a Circumflex in the Nominative Case. Some Grammars have
the

the Rule thus, *Feminina in o faciunt genitivum in ūs, & alios casus in ô*. Some presume to decline these words after the *Latine* manner, and would have 'em make *onis* in the *genitive* Case, the Analogy and Rightness of which I could never be satisfied in. If they had said *ôis* vel *ŭs*, it would have corresponded to the *Greek* Paradigm. But things that are dubious must be left so.

For the *Genitive* Plural of *Greek* Nouns, which I think is untaken notice of in our *Grammar*, some have this Rule, *Genitivus pluralis exit in ōv, quod Latini, cum suo more declinant, vertunt in um*; ut, *Epigrammatōv*, *Epigrammatum*; *hæreseōv*, *hæresium*, &c. Mr. *Walker*, in his *Improvements*, writeth thus,

Sometimes *Greek* words have their *Greek* Termination written in *Latine* Letters: as, *Hæreseōn*, *Epigrammatōn*, *Metamorphoseōn*.

Under *Quarta* declinatio.

Dativus ui habet, & interdum etiam *u*—Quære, Whether if *etiam* were left out, and *per apocopen* added, it would not be easier taken notice of.

To *Rara avis in terris, nigroque simillima cygno*, Mr. *Hoole* adds, *Vera fides*. Q. Whether it be not a very pertinent Addition. Q. also, Whether such a double Rule as this may not be properly added, *Substantivum quandoque subauditur*; ut, *Ne magnus tennem despicio*. Cum *res*, *opus*, *negotium*, aut *aliquod simile* supprimitur, *adjectivum est neutrius generis*; ut, *Omnia vestra cum charitate fiant*, sc. *opera*. Let all your *Works* (not your *Things*) be done with *Charity*. Certainly in all *Translations* great respect ought to be had to *Idioms* and the *Sense* of the Place. Some have thought that, according to *Knowledge*, which *Beza* from the *Original* well translates, *ut scientes decet*, ought not to be rendered so, but according to *Wisdom* or *Prudence*, or as becometh wise Men: And that, *The effectual fervent Prayer* availeth much, ought to be rendred, *The inly or truly fervent*. Thou therefore endure not *Hardness*, but *Hardship*. And that the *Archaism* in *Judges*, *all to*, and *all to* brake his Scull, should be rejected. But

Additions

Additions must be made sparingly to our *Grammar*, that what is wanting may be made up by *Annotations*. Nevertheless *quære* still, Whether after *Doroberniam proficisci*, it may not be proper to add, *Aliquando aliud adjectivum Substantivè, vel sine substantivo positum*. No matter for Examples, they will occur often.

Si facis ut patriæ sis idoneus, for *sit*. I should not have taken notice of this, but that no Edition mends it.

Contubernalis, commilito, conservus, cognatus, being Examples to the Rule, *Quære*, Whether they should not be in *Italick* Letters.

Communis, alienus, &c. Here the whole Rule is put in the Margin, which certainly is needless.

Regni cum Societate numeravit, for *muneravit*. So Mr. Hoole has it: and it is plain by the Rule in the *Accidence*, that *muneravit* ought to be the word.

De me nunquam bene meritus est. In the *Construing-book* it is *meritus es*; and *meritus est* follows in the next Line. What if it were, *Tu de me bene meritus es: hoc de illo non merui?*

Ponuntur & absolute cum verbo est, ut actum est, &c. Q. Whether these be not rather *Impersonals* than *Supines*: but because *cessatum est satis* is a fine Example, I would not have it left out for any thing. Let Criticks cavil as long as they will, It is impossible for the *Grammar* to be so well done, as not to be liable to some Exceptions.

Index Nominum & Verborum should be Printed a little fairer: it is an useful Piece.

Some Questions.

1. Whether adding after *tristis* the declining of a *comparative* Adjective may not be proper; Mr. Haines has added at the End of his *Construing-book*, the Declination of a *comparative*, undoubtedly to supply the want of it in the *Grammar*.

2. Whether *Comparationum Typus* in the *Grammar* be a thing of any great use. I have not found it much taken notice of in other *Grammars*. Our *Question-writers* upon
the

the *Accidence*, as *Brinsley*, *Dugard*, and *Hoole*, and also *Walker* in his *Improvements*, do all make ado with it, more I think than needs. If a Child be well grounded in declining all such Adjectives as are plain and *positive*, and afterwards *Comparatives*, the *Superlatives* will be easy to decline. The main of this business lies, in bringing a Child to consider, what degree of *Comparison* an *Adjective* is, and then to compare it, and when he has compared it, to decline his word then. Why should Children have Tasks set 'em, which waste their time and profit little? But because some may not be satisfied so, What if three or four *Examples* were made choice of, and declined thro' every *degree* and *gender*, to the ending of the *genitive Case*, with an *&c.* and at the Conclusion to give a direction for the young Scholar to learn the rest of the Cases from the declining of *Adjectives* in the *Rudiments*? I cannot think but this will profit more than learning by *Comparationum Typus* will.

Mr. *Brinsley*, in his *Posing of the Parts*, first gives an Example of two Cases only, and afterward adds a *Table* of three Examples, comparing the first in four Cases, and the two next in the Nominative and Genitive only, with an *&c.* at the end. Mr. *Dugard*, in his *Rudiments*, gives Three Examples, and Mr. *Hoole* likewise Three, and decline 'em throughout, but Mr. *Walker*, in his *Improvements*, only gives Directions how to do it, and leaves it to the Scholar to find out; which, undoubtedly, after one Case or two, must needs be the most profitable way.

And as touching a *Paradigm* of a *Comparative*, Mr. *Danes*, in his *Light to Lilie*, declines *melior* after *tristis* throughout. Mr. *Hoole*, in a Book of his entituled, *An Easy Entrance to the Latine Tongue*, declines *durior* throughout among the Rules of Comparison.

3. Whether the three Verses at *A maneo mansi minui* were not better left out, and *emineo*, and *præmineo* added to, or inserted among Verbs, whose *Simples* are out of use, under the Rule. *Verba composita quorum simplicita*, &c. The *Oxford Grammar* is positive they come from *mineo*, an old Verb; and it is not very likely, that *emineo*, and *emaneco* should

should be both Compounds of the same Verb. They are fine Verses indeed, but if they contain an Error, What should they be let stand for?

4. Whether it would not be proper to put *Neutra in ui*, in the Margent over against, *Et quaecunque in ui formantur neutra Secundæ*?

I think I have done for the present.

And now should it be ask'd me, Whether I do think every thing I have taken notice of worthy the *Observation* of others? I answer, *No*; I am far from it: I would not alter *halcyonis*, nor *mulier*, nor any other Particular I have taken notice of, so long as I was satisfied, they did well as they are placed, tho' it should not be strictly right. *Mulier* is taken notice of under the second special Rule, and is own'd not to belong to it: and for *halcyonis*, Why may not it be a *Nominative Case*, as well as *lien*, and *mugilis*?

If a Grammar must be made for Children, there must be *Condescensions* in it, and *Authority* must put the *Censorious* to Silence.

It is a common saying, *That which is every body's Business is nobody's*. The Truth of this has been the cause of so many Faults creeping into our *Grammar*, but I hope all such as are *Lovers* of good Order, and a legal Protestant Government, will oppose them: And tho' some say, There's abundance of Trash in *Lilie's Grammar*, and so take here and there a little, where they see good, to patch up a slight Scholar, I am far from being of the Opinion of such; not that I hold all in it equally *necessary* to be learned Off-book, but look upon it all to be one time or other *useful*.

Some in teaching of *Syntaxis* teach but one *Example* to a Rule. This has been in some Places a prevailing Custom too much. Did they teach two *Examples* to a Rule, for Instance, the two first, and three where there are no more, they would find the *Grammar* run more Oration-like, and learn more pleasantly. It would also prevent Crossing and Marking their *Grammars*, unless a little *Stroke* should be given by a Chance, where the Rule mentions two Cases, e. g. at *Adjectiva, quæ ad copiam*, after the *first* or *second*

E

Example,

Example, to draw a short Line under *Quæ regio*. This, I think, would be much better than learning one Example only: but many are of Opinion, those *Schools* do best and fastest, which teach all. *Scholars* find the Benefit of it at last, tho' some think it tedious, and the time long, before a Child can learn his *Grammar* so. However *two Examples* or *three* are better than *one* only, and by reason of the Pleasantness, as soon if not sooner learned. A little Patience at the first learning over, renders all after-learnings still easier and easier: and if Children learn all at first, it will afterwards be Pleasant to them.

I cannot here but take notice of the great Variety of Men's Opinions. I find by some Writers formerly, *Lilie's Grammar* was found Fault with for not having *Examples* enough; 'tis now found Fault with for having too many. What shall be done in this Case? Surely *Authority* must interpose. People cannot plead *Conscience* in this, as they do in some Points of *Religion*; and they must be *Obedient*, unless they will *resist* all *lawful* Government.

And now if it be ask'd me, Where the Fault of all this chiefly lies? I must needs say, I think our *Bishops*, and other *Ecclesiastical Governours*, have omitted taking such Care of this Matter, as may be Wish'd they had; but I doubt not, but it is for lack of *Information*. I take it for granted, that no Man whatsoever may teach either Publicly or Privately, any other *Grammar* but *Lilie's*; a Better they cannot teach; for my part I know of none so Good, no, not nigh: I pray *God*, care may be taken of this weighty Concern hereafter, for little Children's Sakes.

Some are for a slight learning of *Grammar*, others are for new *Systems*, both which ways are very hurtful, and the *latter* especially; and all is to bring Children on the faster. Thus they strive to make Children *Scholars*, before they have Years for it; a very preposterous thing, and which did not use to be the Custom of *former* and *wiser* Times.

I hope this imperfect percurfory Attempt will give no Offence; if it should, I shall be sorry for it. The Zeal I
have

have always had for the Good of little Children, has been the only Motive to make me undertake it.

The late Mr. *Hoole*, who has been laborious, and travell'd hard in this Matter, has had *four Editions* of his *Grammatica Latina, in Usum Scholarum adornata*, with the Approbation of the late Bp. *Sanderson*: And another Author since (viz. Mr. *Wheeler* late School-master of Gloucester) has published a *Grammar* entituled, *The Royal Grammar* Reformed into a more easy Method, for the better understanding of the *Engliss*, and more easy attainment of the *Latin* Tongue. Approved by *Edw. Gloucester*, Nov. 6th 1695. But what signifies a single *Bishop's* Judgment in this Case? *Bishops* have other things to mind indeed, than recommending New *Grammars*; nay, 'tis their Duty, I presume, to defend the *Old*, and to suffer no other to be Taught. Let him that doubts of this see the *Canons of the Church*, and read the *Act of Uniformity*. If Alterations be made in our *Grammar*, I suppose they ought to have (especially if they be considerable) the *Approbation* of our *Reverend Convocation*, in the first place, and afterward by them be recommended to his *Sacred and most Serene Majesty*, for *Approbation* and *Establishment*; and it cannot be supposed our *Reverend Convocation* will ever condescend to any great *Alterations* making, in a thing that has been so long establish'd, and so diligently examin'd by Learned Men, their *Predecessors*, and which (with all the Imperfections it can be charged with) is already so well, as to have none fit to be compared with it. Nay, I believe it is impossible for a better *Grammar* to be establish'd by *Royal Authority*, for publick Use, than this; which has been, and is already establish'd: and tho' some things may be easily altered in it, yet to pretend to *absolute* Perfection, and *critical* Unexceptionableness, especially in a thing that requires a *condescension* to *Children's* Capacities, is what I hope no *Judges of Grammar* (whether appointed by our most *Gracious King in Council*, or by our most *Reverend Convocation*) will ever pretend to. How nobly, how learnedly, how excellently has our *Grammar* been Defended, by that *eminently* Learned and Pious Man, the late Mr.

Stockwood, in his *Grammatical Disputations* ! And all, both eminent and inferior, Masters of School-learning have travell'd in the same Paths, 'till of late, that *Singularity* and *Heterodoxy* have crept into too many of our Schools, for want of better looking after. The late Reverend Mr. *T. Willis*, in his *Proteus Vincetus*, or *Anglicisms Latinized*, complaining of the *Ambition* that was in his time of making many Books, and of the Vanity of it, writeth thus, *Verum non est aliubi prorsus justior hæc querela, quàm in re Scholasticâ, ubi totidem penè reperiuntur Grammaticæ, quot Grammatici, & Novellæ Institutiones, abortientis preli offæ, hebdomadatiùm protruduntur* : Which he wrote after long Experience in his Profession, and I believe when he was very Old. The late Reverend Dr. *Mill* has said, *Philology* never was at a greater height in *England*, than when our *Grammar* was composed. And seeing all Nations have a certain *Grammar* to learn by, as the *French* and *Scots* have *Despauter*, 'tis pity that any other but our Establish'd *Grammar* should be suffered to be taught in *England*, for *Childrens* Sakes, who oftentimes are upon *Necessity* removed from one School to another.

Postscript.

P O S T S C R I P T.

NOW after all, being very sensible my self of several Imperfections in this small Performance, tho' of none *in my Intention*; (for I truly wish my Country well, and *young Beginners* in Learning an easy and a happy Progress): and not only so, but having had already (upon a Representation made of this Design to *some learned Gentlemen*) some *small Objections* made to it, I am willing to add something in further *Vindication* of some few Particulars, which may be liable to Censure.

In the first Place I am told, That it is not, *Adsis lætitiæ Bacchus dator*, but *Adsit*: if this be so, then I believe, that the *only Authority*, that can be pretended, for *Bacchus* being a *Vocative Case*, is utterly taken away.

In Objection against *meridies*, it is said *facies* is an easier Example: if this be allowed, it will however be proper to put *dies* before *meridies* in the Rule following. But why is not *meridies* as easy an Example as any other? If any good Reason can be given for it, I think it must be this; In many remote Places, Children are suffered, thro' the *Negligence of Masters*, to pronounce the word false, putting as it were a *circumflex* upon *di* in *meridies*. Let but Children be taught to Accent the word aright, and to *acute* the *antepenultim Syllable*, and then it will be as easy a word as any. So in many places they say *erimus*, *eritis*, and our *present Grammars* have these words mark'd long, which is not a small Error.

Marg. By the figure *Evocation*, And, *Except Do and its Compounds*: It has been granted, these things needed not have been added. But, except *Ego, nos, Tu & vos*: to this say some, It is a true Rule. *I answer*, That is not the thing *in Question*, but whether it be *pertinent* or no. The Question is, Whether the Rule was not *plain enough* before; *full*, and yet *without Superfluity*, to which Fault it is now liable, and for the *Honour of the Nation* ought not to be suffer'd. 'Tis very hard, if when Children come to *make Latin*, Masters cannot be at the Pains to tell 'em such a thing as *that*, and which they will have occasion still to tell 'em, notwithstanding it be *most needlessly* there put.

Fur-

Further allowing this simple Addition to be good, which I (for my part) cannot, if it had been carried far enough according to the design of it, It must have been thus, Except *Ego, nos, Tu* and *vos*, and every vocative Case by the *Figure Evocation*: which how proper it would have been, let any Body judge.

The *Optative* and *Potential Moods* may be both left out, say some, and never the worse. 'Tis true, many do leave 'em out, and very few teach them; but if they be left out, there must be a *Note* to supply the want of them, and to let *Incipients* know they are the same with the *Subjunctive* in Voice. Many Authors have done so, but whether it may be proper for us to leave them both out, is some Question; for the *two first Tenses of the Potential Mood* seem very *useful* and *necessary*, and the rest are of use some times. I think this may be safely said of it, that it is over-clogged with *Signs* for Children to learn. As for the *Optative Mood*, which is the ancient *Mood*, when all is done, whether it be proper to leave it out, and add a *Note* as some have done, or put the *two first Tenses*, and add a *Note*, or leave it whole, for Masters to teach, or omit as they please; such Scruples as these ought to be resolved by such learned and experienced Men, as the Reverend Dr. *Bland*, and others, who have both learned and ever taught our establish'd *Grammar*.

A Participle of the Future Tense. *Futurus to be*, or *about to be*. What need was there of this, say I, more now than formerly? *Ans.* Because perhaps, 'twas wanting. I will forbear saying, If it was, who had *Authority* to insert it? But are not all the *Participles of irregular Verbs* wanting in the *Infinitive Mood* there? True; but they are to be found in the *declining of the Verbs*. *Ans.* And so is *futurus* in the declining of *sum*. If this must be, I think *Participle* is enough to precede it; *Future Tense* just before, and *sum* and *futurus* being sufficient for such a little compass.

Dativum postulant—Let who will defend the Addition, I still perswade my self, that no learned Man (after a serious Consideration) will be for having *satis bene & malè* added there, the *Verbs* compounded with these *Adverbs* by their
Signi-

Signification, so plainly belonging to *Imprimis Verba Significantia commodum, aut, &c.* And I think this to be undeniable, viz. That the inserting of them spoils one of the most frequently used Rules, in all the *Regimental* part of *Syntax*. Besides I do not think it will be an easy matter to find different Parts of Speech (as *Adverbs* and *Prepositions*) put so together into one Rule in all the *Grammar*, the *Method* whereof ('till of late) its very *Enemies* (tho' in some Particulars apt to carp) could not but admire and praise.

Commune animantium omnium — Tho' this be undoubtedly an excellent and pertinent Example to the Rule, yet I have heard the *Grammar* several times reflected on for it, but without just cause; for the best of *Latin Authors* is quoted for it. Children (I question not) would learn it with as much *Innocency* still, as they did in former times, if it were not for older People, that should be wiser. Many *Examples* (no doubt) might be substituted in its place; such as *Commune bonorum omnium est pacis & tranquillitatis cupiditas*, or *appetitus*. *Commune piorum omnium est puritatis amor*. It would be a rare thing indeed, if one could have a *Grammar*, no part of which should be found fault with; but that must never be expected.

At *Hæc tria Impersonalia*, some leave out *est*. In the Year 1684, amongst many other things, *R. G. of New-Castle* wrote against it. I do not see why it may not be reckoned an *Impersonal*, as well as the rest. Allowances must be made for *Children's Capacities*, notwithstanding all the carplings of the *Censorious*. If the Example, *Prudentis est multa dissimulare*, be thought too extensive, *quædam* or *aliquando* might moderate it: but I think it contains in it nothing but a Point of Wisdom.

These are the only material *Objections* I have as yet met with. More *Alterations* than I have mention'd, might have been taken notice of, but I may perhaps find that I have done too much already. Nevertheless One, I fear, I have miss'd, and seeing my Papers are not with me, I am willing to insert it (if it be a Repetition) for *sureness*'s sake. It is at a *Pronoun* in the *Accidence*, After the 15 *Pronouns* it follows, *whereof 4 have the Vocative Case, &c.* Now the
Question

Question is, Whether it be *proper* to place this *here*? and, Whether it would not be better to say, *whereof Three are Substantives*, Ego, tu, sui, and all others *Adjectives*?

So far as I can find, all our *English Writers* whatsoever, take Notice of this *Division* of a *Pronoun*, and I cannot think but it is of great use to Children. Nor do our own Writers this only, but I believe *foreign Authors* too. A learned *Transylvanian*, in his *Grammatical Institutions*, takes notice of it.

Mr. Hoole, at the ending of the *fourth Declension*, placeth the Rule for the Vocative Case of Pronouns thus, All *Pronouns want* (but our word is *lack*, and I am for no needless change) *the Vocative Case, except Tu, meus, noster, and nostras*. Doubtless such a Rule is most properly plac'd some where among the *Declensions*.

Articles are borrow'd of the Pronoun, &c. Q. Whether it would not be proper here to add some Definition or Description of an *Article*. e. g. An *Article* is a Note or Mark, shewing what Gender a Noun is of. Or, an *Article* is a Note or Mark, to know the Gender of a Noun by, in declining. 'Tis agreed on all hands (so far as I find) that an *Article, quatenus Article*, is a word of no Signification, but only a *term of Art*, and several *Grammarians*, for that very Reason, give a Definition of it, I believe, to make Children better understand it.

Verba accusandi — gen. postulant, qui crimen significat. This has pass'd abundance of Impressions of late. It always was formerly, *qui crimen significet*, according to the Rule, *Qui, cum habet vim causalem, subjunctivum postulat.* Oxford, and I doubt not but Cambridge too, adheres to the ancient Impression.

And now to hasten to a Conclusion.

One great *Objection* against the *establish'd Grammar* is, that a Scholar might be made *much sooner* otherways. Certainly if a Child be taught to know, *what Part of Speech a word is*; can decline a *Noun*, and conjugate a *Verb*, know the *Signs of the Cases*; the *Degrees of Comparison*; the *Persons of a Pronoun*; the different sorts of *Verbs*; the *Signs of the Moods and Tenses*; when the *English* of *sum* is a *Verb*, and
when

when a Sign of the passive Voice ; the Signs or Endings of a Participle ; the Use of Prepositions, and the three Concords, and can write competently well, he may be suppos'd to have a good Foundation for beginning to make *Latin* : Yet for all this, the other Parts of *Grammar* will still be of absolute Necessity, for the making of a good and perfect Scholar. And tho' some say, They would not have Children spend so much time in *Grammar*, but be had to learn *Authors* ; This can never be a good way, because 'tis having them to *Authors* before they are fit for them, or can profit by them, and all for want of a maturity of Years, and a good Foundation in *Grammar*. This seems to me to be what *Quintilian* calls *ambitiosâ festinatione à posterioribus incipere*, beginning at the wrong end first ; 'tis a going the wrong way to work ; and they that use it, do but as the same Author teaches, *discipulos compendio morari*, with their Compendiousness and Conciseness, hinder the Proficiency of their Scholars. 'Tis an usual Saying with some, When a Man is perfect in his Profession, he is *Grammar'd* in it ; and the old Proverb in this Case may be remarkable, *Quærens compendium, inveni dispendium* : I hoped for Help, but I found Hinderance.

I hope None will take *Exceptions* at this, That a Man of my Age and Profession should trouble himself with such little Business ; and say, that I might have found my self other Employment. If any should, I answer, That it seems to me (as the Case is) as necessary a Piece of Service, next to the Discharge of my Duty in my Place, as I could undertake. My great Desire is, not to see Children wrong'd in their Instruction and Education, nor the Prerogative of Sovereign Power injured. We have a *Grammar* established by supreme and just Authority, and that in a legal way ; for it was first Recommended by the Reverend Convocation to our King's most Royal Ancestor, King Henry the VIII, before it was Established : And what Authority will this *Grammar* be of, if every Corrector may presume to alter what he pleases in it ?

And as for Age, I think, If both an Older, and more Learned, and much Greater Man than I am, had undertook

this Matter, it could not well have been a *Dis honour* to him, to have endeavour'd at least to do little Children Service. I may *safely*, I hope, and *without Dissimulation* presume to say this for my self, that neither *Vain-glory*, nor *Prospect of Profit*, have moved me to this Undertaking; but *chiefly* and *only*, a *sincere* Desire for the good of *Children's Education*. The Adversities of the World have School'd me sufficiently, not to look after great things in it; And I have no more to add but this, That I heartily wish, The *larger Catechism*, mention'd in the *Canon*, were taught both in *Latin* and *Greek* in all Schools, as well as the *lesser*. For what signifies *Learning* without *Religion*? So far is *Learning* from profiting without *Religion*, that it does but aggravate a Man's Guilt; and 'tis to be feared, some *Great Scholars* do not prove *Good Men*, for want of being well Principled and Grammar'd in Religion, as well as humane Literature. And this may be easily done, without learning the *larger Catechism* off-book; for if the *Latin* Scholars construe and turn out of *English* into *Latin*, and the *Greek* Scholars construe and turn out of *Latin* into *Greek*, they will thereby reap a double Profit, by learning *Religion* and *Language* both at the same time. If it be *objected*, It is too large for School-boys to learn, and would take up too much time to teach it all; I *answer*, They that think so, need not teach it all. I have an old *Latin Catechism* (which had been formerly taught in *Thame School*) where the (a) *Ten Commandments*, and other *principal* Parts of that *Catechism*, are mark'd out to be learned, and the rest omitted, one Half of a *Parenthesis* being put before the *Question*, and the other half at the end of the *Answer*. If such a Method as this should be taken, it would be likely to give occasion, one time or other, to such especially as shall be designed to study *Divinity*, to peruse the rest. I have added this, because I am not willing to conceal any thing, which I think likely to be Profitable to a *Grammar School*.

(a) *Psal. 119. 100. I understand more than the Ancients: because I keep thy Precepts. Or, as it is in the Common-prayer Translation, I am wiser than the Aged: because I keep thy Commandments.*

